R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 627 VT 003 307

UNIVERSITY PERSPECTIVES ON MANPOWER.

BY- MILLER, PAUL A.
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION (DOL), WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE JUL 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, *UNIVERSITIES, RESPONSIBILITY, RESEARCH, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, SPEECHES,

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING ARE MOVING INCREASINGLY INTO THE PUBLIC POLICY SECTOR OF THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OF THE COUNTRY. THE MODERN DEVELOPMENT OF ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS AND REFINED MANAGEMENT OF PRODUCTION SYSTEMS INCLUDE THE CENTERS OF KNOWL EDGE AS IMPORTANT PARTS OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE. THE UNIVERISTY HAS FOUR GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO MANPOWER. THERE IS A CONTEMPORARY NEED FOR THE UNIVERSITY TO BROADEN THE NOTION OF MANPOWER TO INCLUDE THE FULL MANPOWER SPECTRUM. IT SHOULD ALSO GIVE RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION EMPHASIS TO THE AREAS OF STATECRAFT AND VOCATIONAL OR TECHNICAL EDUCATION BY COMPREHENDING, INVENTING, SUGGESTING, AND EVALUATING PROMISING AVENUES OF TECHNICAL WORK. THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE MODERN UNIVERSITY TO INFLUENCE A DYNAMIC MANPOWER POLICY BY IMPROVING ITS ARTICULATION AND INTERDEPENDENCE WITH THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. IT MUST ALSO RECONCILE ITS TRADITIONAL SENTIMENT OF DISENGAGEMENT WITH A CONTEMPORARY NEED TO CONSIDER THAT CONTINUOUS EDUCATION ON A LIFETIME BASIS IS REQUIRED. THE UNIVERSITY, AS A CENTRAL FORCE IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM, IS NOT ALTOGETHER PREPARED TO GIVE MEANING TO THE VAST TECHNOLOGICAL MACHINERY OF AN URBAN INDUSTRIAL CIVILIZATION, BUT AS IT FINDS NEW WAYS TO INFLUENCE UNDERSTANDING AND REGARD FOR THE WORLD OF HUMAN WORK, IT MAY HELP IN ACHIEVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR WHICH TECHNOLOGY IS DESIGNED IN THE FIRST PLACE. DISCUSSION PERIOD COMMENTS ARE INCLUDED. THIS SPEECH WAS DELIVERED AT THE SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM (WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 14, 1966). COPIES OF THIS DOCUMENT ARE AVAILABLE FROM MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF MANPOWER POLICY, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 14TH STREET AND CONSTITUTION AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210. (BS)

AUG 12 1967

ED018627

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM

University Perspectives on Manpower

by PAUL A. MILLER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR • MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

VT003 30

- This report is one in a series of proceedings of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. It presents a condensed transcript of the seminar held in Washington, D.C., September 14, 1966.
- The purpose of the seminars is to provide a platform for guest speakers and for members of the Department of Labor and other agencies concerned with manpower problems to discuss issues arising from the development of an Active Manpower Policy.
- Expressions of opinion by the speaker and those participating from the audience are not to be construed as official opinions of the U.S. Government or the Department of Labor.

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

University Perspectives on Manpower

by PAUL A. MILLER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator

OPENING REMARKS

Chairman—Dr. Curtis C. Aller, Director
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research

DR. ALLER: I think we are probably all here. Perhaps I should introduce myself; I'm Curtis Aller, director of OMPER in the Department of Labor.

I was horrified this summer when Mr. Behlow, who organizes and keeps the seminar series going, reminded me that I had been here for a year and had not participated in the program, let alone even been here as a member of the audience. So I agreed that I would do my best to start this year's series off.

Now, this seminar is actually the 24th in the series of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program that began in April 1964. The seminars are sponsored by the Department of Labor, specifically the Manpower Administration, to provide an opportunity for members and invited guests of the Department to discuss the issues that are raised in the *Manpower Report of the President*, or that might be raised in that report, and in the development of this long-term endeavor that we have been engaged in which we call an Active Manpower Policy.

We are fortunate to have the Honorable Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with us today to lead off our series. Dr. Miller is a very recent recruit to Government. He was appointed on August 10th of this year and arrived on duty August 16th. He has simply had time to move his family, meet a few people, and begin to familiarize himself with the range of duties that confronts him, their complexities, and, more importantly, some of the unsolved problems that we face in our joint relationship between Labor and HEW in the manpower field.

Dr. Miller has served as chairman of the Colombia Commission on Higher Education and the board of directors of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. In addition, he is currently a member of the American and Rural Sociological Societies.

He carries on some further activities as the chairman of a number of committees, including the Task Force on Agriculture and Engineering in a national study of professional schools and world affairs, the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in West Virginia, and the Advisory Committee on Health of the Appalachian Regional Commission. He serves, further, on the President's National Commission on Food and Fiber.

Dr. Miller, I hope that is the full range of your outside duties. For some reason, I am beginning to wonder whether you will have time to serve as the Assistant Secretary for Education.

Dr. Miller began his professional career as Assistant County Agricultural Agent in West Virginia in 1939. He moved on as County Agricultural Agent in Ritchie and Nicholas Counties in 1941.

He enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps in 1942 and served as a first lieutenant until 1946. After the war he went to Michigan State University, where he remained until he left to become the president of West Virginia University. As a matter of fact, we were just chatting and, in my short tenure at Michigan State as a member of the economics department, my stay overlapped part of his period there as provost of Michigan State University.

Let me just add that Dr. Miller has written extensively. He has published a book called *Community Health Action* in 1953, and in 1961 he was coauthor of *Higher Agricultural Education in Colombia.* That is perhaps sufficient in the way of background. I deem it a great privilege and personal honor to be able to welcome you to our informal seminar this afternoon.

University Perspectives on Manpower

An Address by Dr. Paul A. Miller

DR. MILLER: Dr. Aller, members of the seminar. One learns everytime he has a somewhat different assignment or a shift in his assignment that one of the things he must do immediately is correct misstatements such as those which public relations people in the press departments work out for him. You have done me a very real service here in my first informal presentation in Washington. Those remarks remind me that I am still operating with a public relations biographical sketch from West Virginia University, and somehow I will have to hasten home and come up with something more current.

That sort of out-of-date, West Virginia-oriented biographical statement brings to mind an old story from the side of West Virginia next to Virginia, in what I call the Pocahontas Mountain area. This was a great sorghum-molasses-making area in the early days. On a particular farm, a boy attempted to sample the molasses, as any boy would, when no one was looking. In so doing, the boy fell into one of the innumerable barrels which are used in the molasses-making craft. With great difficulty, he finally came out over the side, utterly exhausted. Glancing around quickly to see if anyone was watching, he looked down at the mess he had made of himself and said to no one in particular, "I hope my tongue is equal to the task."

Dr. Aller did classify me correctly as to the first few weeks I have spent in Washington. I am a recent recruit. As so many people in academic administration, I made at one time what I thought to be

a short-term decision, and found myself between Friday and Monday an administrator. As the years wear on, however, one finds that he does not move out of that tract so readily. He always knows that he is going to make his way back to the more orthodox academic assignment. But as the years go by, especially if one becomes a university president, he begins to say each morning to that face in the mirror, "What a charlatan you have become." He thinks about the speeches he has to give that day on every topic under the sun, not one of which does he really know anything about.

One of the rationales for making the decision to enter the Government was that I might not have to be so much of a charlatan. At least I could learn something about the macrooperations of our country, the Federal Government, and the importance of education in public policy. I am finding already, however, that with Mr. Behlow and many others twisting my arm, the Assistant Secretary for Education may turn out to be an even worse charlatan than any university president! I made a plea to Mr. Behlow when he called me in Morgantown that this was one field in which I could not presume to come before a learned group of specialists. But about the time Dr. Aller was there, the university has sponsored a seminar on manpower problems especially applicable to the Appalachian region. I was then in the midst of a very trying issue at the university—a possible strike of the employees of the university's physical plant over negotiation of a new recognition agreement between the university and the employees' union. By the day of the university seminar, I was more interested in my own manpower problems and employment than I was in the mass problem in the United States. Thus, the previous seminar experience cannot really be considered preparation for today's talk, but I told Mr. Behlow that I would come and try nonetheless.

I think all of you would agree that institutions of higher learning are moving increasingly upstage, increasingly into the public policy sector of the development process of the country. I would like, therefore, to speak informally about "University Perspectives on Manpower."

Early Forms of the University

As an introductory statement, I want to call your attention to the very earliest forms of the university. Up to a certain point, especially in the medieval forms of the university, preservation of knowledge was the function largely stressed. But during hundreds of years since, it has become commonplace to recognize that preparing people for private and public roles is a standing obligation of the academy. European universities of the 16th and 17th centuries emphasized the preparation of religious, military, and political leaders. This orientation continued for fully two centuries, even to the beginnings of university life in our country. But gradually the base was broadened to include courses of study which dealt increasingly with specific occupations and professions.

The German university, at least until recent vintage, tended to be a federation of research institutes, with not much eye to such matters as the relationship of manpower preparation to economic growth. Both the English and American universities, somewhat in contrast to the German model, stressed teaching and instruction. The British university prepared more than just a few students for public leadership. The impact of this strategy became worldwide. With an emphasis upon public higher education, the American university, after first imitating its European parents, moved toward the preparation of individuals for a growing range of vocations and professions. The importance of economic growth was included in the rationale. Contrasted with the British university, institutions of higher learning in the United States have not taken the direct strategy of training individuals for public or civic leadership. With the invention of State land grants, and various other forms of public institutions, the American university has related itself to producing technical and professional manpower to assist the economic growth of the society as a whole. It is interesting to observe now that the English model of the university is swinging rapidly in the direction of the development of the so-called "red bricks," and American universities are tending to lean toward the British model.

This increasing emphasis on economic development for preparing professionals and certain other levels of technical manpower opened the way for the university to take a place in the structure of industrial life. Knowledge penetrated every aspect of the indus-

trialization process: Unit-part production, matching human skill with the demand for it, increasing the mobility of human resources and hence their flexibility, and elaborating the internal complexity of the industrial process. All of this somehow became intertwined and interwoven. This growing interplay between the centers of knowledge on the one hand and the centers of industry on the other is one of the chief reasons for the sharply increasing complexity of the university itself. There is a great institutionalization of science going on in this country, and a state of flux exists. The Federal Government and the universities are operating as separate research institutes, and part of this is just an annotation, I think, to the industrialization process. The historic functions of many universities have been taken over by other agencies in recent decades. Hence, the industrial system has developed its own personnel training plans, established special efforts in research and development, and, in many instances, contributed materially to the improvement of theory and methodology in the basic and applied arts. In short, the modern development of economic organizations and refined management of production systems include the centers of knowledge as important parts of business and industrial enterprise.

Broadened Notion of Manpower Needed

Thus far, I have made broad, general, historical comments. My remarks now turn to more specific comments about university perspectives on manpower. I am going to make four necessarily general points in terms of responsibilities of institutions of higher learning. The first point concerns the contemporary need of the university to broaden the notion of manpower. It seems to me that manpower is a field which generates one specialized meaning after another. In the last few weeks I have been trying to read like a madman in this and other fields to accommodate the new job. I have not changed this point of view. There are many meanings attached to it. It sustains a strong attachment to economic terms, such as supply-demand balances of labor skills, mobility of such skills, technologically induced changes in occupational structure, and so on. These represent only part of the issue of how people live in the world of work. Of equally vital importance to the university are those social, political, and economic constraints which

retard the optimum development and utilization of human talent.

Viewing the idea of manpower in total, it should also be recognized that the modern university is called upon to entertain the full manpower spectrum, and the institutions of both the social and economic orders must come within this scope. For example, American universities have only indirectly concerned themselves with the art of statecraft, which was really quite a historic break with the English university. Neither have the universities concerned themselves with lower ranges of human skills which may not be the concern of other educational sectors. Instead, the American institution tends to limit its concern to those vocations and professions which fall below the skill levels of statecraft and above the less complex technical vocations and crafts.

One example may suffice to show how universities may fail in viewing the world of work as a whole. This example is found in the historic connections between the State land-grant universities and the field of agriculture. An incredible record of preparing technically proficient people has been compiled. Because human skills have been increasingly upgraded over the past 50 years, capital and technological investment in American agriculture have become so massive that the productivity of farming in America leaps forward at rates in excess of those in industry. For at least 20 years the productivity in agriculture has been growing at a faster rate than industry. The entire effort has been related and justified as an exercise in economic growth. American agriculture is the envy of the whole world. It may be the world's greatest example of diffusing scientific knowledge to the general culture and of upgrading the occupational skills of an entire agrarian class. However, despite this emphasis on university research and education, people now living in rural areas are generally deprived. They have the poorest schools, public services, housing, cultural impressions, and occupational and other forms of counseling in the United States. It is said that one-third of the poverty incidence occurs in rural America, and this audience, I am sure, is well aware of the vast underemployment of the rural labor force and the institutional constraints connected therewith.

In summary, the technical upgrading of rural America, from the standpoint of manpower, has carried with it the most troublesome of consequences. It is an example of something less than the

whole view for the long run. I am asserting that the university has become perhaps the last arrangement in an industrial society which is in a position to point out with detachment the nature of consequences, both intended and unintended.

Expanded University Experimentation Needed

The second point of responsibility concerning the field of manpower relates to the basic aim of university research and experimentation. Past emphasis, and the heavy weight of present accents, tended to the middle ranges of the occupational and professional spectrum. Additional concerns in recent years, such as public and social services, continue to fall in this position. In the future, it would seem to me, more attention should be given to the areas, for lack of a better set of terms, of statecraft and technical and/or vocational education. Simply in passing, I want to mention some areas worthy of far greater university interest for experimentation and demonstration.

One is a broader base in training. I think we need more effort within the university world to determine how best to establish terminal points in the educational ladder so that people may be fully prepared for subprofessional and technical specialities.

The second critical need is in the hard-core poverty area. Although sporadic research and infrequent conferences have contributed to its understanding, it cannot be said that the universities, in terms of off-campus experimentation, demonstrate sustained concern. Even in the more active areas of the universities, such as the extension services, the almost impenetrable nature of hard-core poverty encourages movement along avenues of least resistance. Although it may not be the specific responsibility of the university to directly attack the manpower implications in the hard-core poverty areas, it is their responsibility to be concerned with demonstration and experimentation which would enable a better understanding of their nature. For example, until recently, few professional schools of education recruited, prepared, or assigned teachers to such areas. In this particular year at this moment in history, the universities have not accumulated a sufficient amount of significant experience with the hard-core poverty question.

A third area for experimentation deals with a variety of special

age and sex groups. Again, until recently, the phenomenon of the dropout received only modest concern. The interdisciplinary possibilities of understanding the relationship of student learning to the amalgam of school, family, and community environments have been a fruitful field for research and experimentation for a long time, but we have not done much about it. The universities, however, oriented strongly to middle-income areas, have failed to sustain interest in the phenomenon of the school dropout.

Another issue of unusual implication is the phenomenon of the female worker. With cataclysmic shifts in family life, together with rising educational levels for both men and women, one would expect the sharp increases of women in the labor force to cause a concurrent increase in research devoted to this subject. It seems to me that collegiate circles and institutions of higher learning are now finding their way into a very provocative dimension of the world of work.

The fourth topic heading has to do with the concept of migration. I am very interested in this subject in the comparative sense. The work of Latin America—Peru and Ecuador—was mentioned. The same is true everywhere. The human populations are involved in continuous shifts from one employment region to another. Although a few scholars have concerned themselves with comparative studies of these shifts on a worldwide basis, it is unfortunate that so little is known about the dislocations which follow them. With the current stimulation of the manpower field, new interests in this widespread phenomenon of migration are taking root. However, having been in an area which mainly exports people—the West Virginia and Appalachian area—as well as in Michigan where we had the opposite situation, it seems to me that the institutions of higher learning have a long way to go before achieving adequate understanding of the sociological, psychological, and economic impacts of migration. We also need to know much more about the selective factors involved in the exporting and importing communities. One of the warmest debates I had in legislative circles last year was over the refusal of the State to approve travel vouchers for a group of our researchers going to Dayton and Toledo, places which received migrants from West Virginia. We were interested in what happened to them. I had a vexing time in justifying this support.

Another area deserving consideration is vocational and technical education. Universities have not taken a position of leadership in this particular field. It is almost axiomatic that the communities with the lowest level of human resource development are the very ones which are characterized by limited opportunities of educational attainment. Although it is not the responsibility of the university to provide curricular experiences for all post-high school educational work, it is its responsibility to comprehend, invent, suggest, and evaluate promising avenues of technical work. Only the community colleges of the country and a few other institutions have given imaginative thought to this field.

I would like to expand with a few points gained from my experience in an underdeveloped State in this country. It seems to me that many university people have not actively attempted to clear up a series of "half-truths" in this educational area. One of them may be stated as follows: "Because of wide differences among individuals in ability and aptitude, all individuals should not be expected to perform at the same level. Lower levels of achievement should be expected and substitute goals established for a major portion of our population." Although there are differences to be sure in aptitude and ability, there is also indication that aptitude can be changed or raised. Universities have tended to go along with a kind of misconception of a fair chance—namely, give each student the same curriculum, teach him at the same speed, in the same way, until he proves beyond doubt to his teachers and to himself that he cannot make the grade. This is followed with a misconception of the last chance, which is to assign him to some vocational training sector in order that he may work with his hands.

The host of hidden assumptions in this "fair chance-last chance" process may well lead us toward two or more distinct systems of education in this country. The main one would deal with the middle-class notion of adequate ability, and the others would deal with those who somehow don't fit into it. I remain quite unsure in my own mind, however, as to just which is inadequate—the middle-class notion of aptitude or those who supposedly don't fit into it.

The second half-truth runs as follows: "It is best to consider separately the academic, vocational, and social development of individuals lest undue emphasis be placed on any single aspect." We have often been too intent in higher education on separating edu-

cational experience in this way. In so doing, we have failed to recognize that in the sum total of socialization of human personality, three environments are fused—the family environment, the community environment, and the more formal environment of the school. We have acted, until recently at least, upon the assumption that the school environment could in some fashion make up for deficiencies in the others. Thus, we neatly categorized these environments, separating them even to the organization of the university itself. I would assert that those who teach the student vocational skills that may become obsolete, and those who teach every pupil Latin because it is handy in medical school, along with those who stress neither but concentrate on developing social attitudes—all do the student a disservice from which he may never fully recover. How all these needs may be intertwined for all students, perhaps in differing proportions, is a question which higher education has deferred largely to others. Indeed, with the recent emphasis of colleges and universities on recruiting "good" students, whatever that means, higher education toys with this half-truth within its own precinct as well. I see many institutions of higher learning taking great pride in selecting only the top 10 percent of high school students. This seems to be an easy, cheap way to gain status for the institutions. One has to wonder whether the top 10 percent who go there get much out of it anyway. Academia might do better to worry about the other 90 percent.

The third half-truth may be alternatively stated: "Occupational choice is critically important, for it is a lifetime choice" or "Vocational training of the past is now inadequate; we should be training for vocations such as data processing and computer programming." Everyone is talking about computer programing. The acceleration of occupational change and mobility stresses more the capacity for making changes in skills than the vocational skill itself. I remember Secretary Wirtz exclaiming that the average high school graduate will have to be retrained at least three times. Accordingly, the whole truth will begin to show when we have better long-range planning on a national basis with regard to probable and popular occupational groups during the coming decades and durable learning and skills which might be taught as students prepare to take their place in the world of work. University study and research should be helpful in this task. Indeed, even the col-

lege graduate will face the continuing need for reeducation. In sum, this is another of the areas into which I would like to see the universities probe more deeply.

Increased Contact Between Educational Levels Needed

My third point deals with the necessary loyalty of colleges and universities to the lower school systems. We take pride in the basic scheme of upward mobility in American society; it is largely influenced by the educational system. Although the graduates of the universities give leadership to the activities of the lower school systems, which, in turn, influence the institutions of higher learning, the universities have taken too little interest in the lower schools. To be sure, our system of higher education, along with those of various other disciplines, has contributed to elementary and secondary school curricula. But the institutions of higher learning frequently have failed to comprehend the crucial importance of the lower school system to human resource development. There is a great need for improved articulation and interdependence between the universities and the public schools. I can't put it any simpler than that. I was pleased to see the recent experiments involving new approaches to math, biology, and so on in some of the high school curricula promoted by persons in the higher education community. However, on balance, the modern university has somewhat less than a firm loyalty to the development and enrichment of the lower school system.

In this regard, certain areas of concern are now being suggested. The first deals with the need for improved research on the interplay between family motivation, the capacity for individual learning, and the influence of community services. I am sure that it's going on here and there, but you can go to a lot of colleges and universities and find no interest in these three environments and their constant interaction. Whatever theories help us to understand the processes of human development, ways must be found to reconcile the multiple influences of family, school, and community on human personality. Our approaches to this problem in the modern university have been so fragmented that our knowledge of such interplay has been retarded. The idea of the urban educational park is developing and has great implications for community

schooling. It should be examined from the standpoint of these various requirements in the socialization of the human personality.

I have been interested in the work of a few economists who look at education as an investment. I have managed to skim through the work of Theodore Schultz and others which may eventually enable policymakers and community leaders to consider education not only in sociological and humanistic terms, but also as an economic investment.

Still another area needing future investigation involves the newer ententes emerging now among the Federal, State, and local systems of education. The remarkable proliferation of new tools of resource allocation helps the lower school system assume a central position in the public policy of the country. The responses of local and State governments in this area have great implications for the lower school system and for community life in general. Dramatic fiscal and institutional steps which involve the cooperation of every level of government are already taking place. It is essential that these steps be taken in areas such as Appalachia if the vicious circle of inadequate educational resources is to be broken. The universities have a responsibility to help establish these new Federal-State-local relationships upon a basis of wise reforms.

Perhaps the chief opportunity of a modern university to influence a dynamic manpower policy in this country depends upon a greater loyalty to the lower school system. The Great Society programs suggest that the university move in several directions at once. But it is doubtful that any direction will be so profitable for the university's investment of time, energy, and talent as the closest type of partnership with the lower public schools.

Extended Educational Opportunities Needed

My fourth point refers to the almost revolutionary conclusion, now accepted if not altogether practiced in contemporary education, that learning can no longer be limited to the first quarter of the life cycle. Whether in reference to the tasks of family and community life, or in relation to performance on one's job, it has become clear that continuous education on a lifetime basis is required. The idea that proficiency is a dynamic quality in every occupation has the most profound implications for the responsi-

bilities of the educational system and for continuous retraining programs in both the private and public sectors. This contemporary interest in the continuous meaning of education for both fulfillment in life and proficiency on the job profoundly alters the idea of the university. This is perhaps the greatest challenge of the university in tomorrow's world—how to accommodate the fact that education is a lifelong continuous process, not limited to the first 20 to 22 years of formal schooling. At the same time, it is necessary that the university continue its historic commitment to prepare leaders for the next generation. How to reconcile these long-term and short-term goals is one of the pressing issues facing the university system of this country.

The issue is derived from a fundamental collision between 10 centuries of traditional sentiment about the university idea and the startling new demands placed upon it by the industrial world. The first force, the stable organization of sentiment about the university, is the belief accepted over the course of centuries that the university can best serve if it remains substantially disengaged from society. An array of safeguards nurtures and sustains this isolation —academic freedom and tenure, not-so-subtle buffers against the political institution, and, especially, a model of organization that emphasizes the preparation of leaders for the future. Historically a generation ahead and a generation behind, the university has never quite found a clear way to confront the present. Fortunately, it is a stance that won unusual forbearance from society.

The traditional sentiment of disengagement encourages certain secondary features, including an ease with the adolescent student. This model of organization traditionally gives the teacher a central role, provides procedures for gaining consensus which are slow and conservative, and employs whimsical techniques for achieving goals. Research and scholarship now characterize university life, but it should not be forgotten that these essential functions are relatively recent in the history of universities. They are so recent, in fact, that even today they are supported in a piecemeal if not ramshackle fashion. That is one side of the force brought upon us by the continuous-education concept.

The second force in the collision consists of the modern claims of society upon the university. It is a demand that the university recognize and meet the needs of the present. The surface features

of this demand are visible to all—wave after wave of new students, massive research programs in the present national interests, an ever-increasing number of manpower requests, the pull of knowledge to vexing public problems, gratifying expanded interest in the creative arts, and legions of adult learners pursuing this new necessity of lifelong education. I think this is a critical issue—to resolve how the historical sentiment of disengagement can be accommodated to the elaborate tentacles which now reach out to involve the university in the contemporary activities of the community. The issue is basic in the relationship of the university to the whole question of manpower in a developing economy, both with reference to the legitimate place of these activities within the university and to the contribution which they make to the university. That there is substantial room for accommodation is without doubt. For example, although a type of State university was suggested quite early in the 19th century by the labor movement, and was planned as a "people's college" to be established in Ithaca, N.Y., the relationship of the public university to the industrial classes has been most erratic. Even today, in those institutes devoted to labor education, few men relate the resources of the university to the preponderant masses of industrial workers in society. It is pleasing to see that recognition is being given to this void on almost every campus. This void is so great at times that the modern industrial corporation has moved to establish, quite apart from their productive processes, new forms of educational work. I don't have to mention the OEO, the Job Corps, and other types of programs which have developed only in the last few years. I am urging that a more vital consideration be given to the university as a sponsorship organization in society.

I would assert that the modern university has become such an enterprise already, to an extent beyond the willing admission of most academic men. Until the divergence between fact and belief is reduced, the university may continue to permit its linkages with society to multiply and grow in whimsical fashion, with others assuming the innovative functions in the face of the university's unorganized approach. I would assert, further, that maintaining the necessary disengagement itself will depend largely on the university's willingness to give positive attention to all of its many functions. I am suggesting an open and thorough consideration of

the university as a whole, in terms of both its intramural and extramural duties.

The university, now so much a central force in the American system, is not altogether prepared to give meaning to the vast technological machinery of an urban industrial civilization. As a people, we express greater interest in erecting the facade of machinery and mechanism than in achieving the quality of life for which the machinery is designed in the first place. As the university finds new and enduring ways to influence our understanding and regard for the world of human work, so may it help fill the hollowness one sometimes finds behind the facade.

DISCUSSION PERIOD

DR. ALLER: Personally, I found that very thoughtful and provocative. Talking about selection of students for universities brought to mind something I had forgotten for years. Sumner Slichter, one of my professors one year when I was at Harvard, used to tell us that one of the reasons he enjoyed teaching at Harvard was that, on the whole, about 90 percent of the students were far more able than the faculty. He enjoyed being at Harvard because he wanted to be around a lot of bright people. He never persuaded himself that he contributed enormously to their intellectual and professional development.

Is there a volunteer who is anxious to start the discussion process going with a question or a comment?

FROM THE FLOOR: Since you just recently came from academia, Dr. Miller, what is the impact on the university of the different pressures coming from Federal programs? OMPER has recently issued a letter soliciting interest on the part of the academic community in actively engaging its programs with our research activities. It seems to me that a certain optimum point has to be reached in the cooperation efforts between the universities, the Federal Government, and the community. To what extent can this coupling activity be an evil and to what extent a benefit? There is certainly a possibility of distorting the university's role if they respond to too many pressures simultaneously.

DR. MILLER: All I can do is probably restate it another way. First of all, I want to get in my own bias. The traditional role of the university is not adequate for the important task of disseminating knowledge to society. A university cannot really practice its older historic concept of disengagement resembling a monastic separation of scholars eating and talking only with each other. We have an image of the ambling professor on tree-shaded walks. There are vestiges of this but we have not realized that it is largely unreal.

We have to accept this recognition, and I believe the university can take an active part in encouraging this acceptance. But it can go too far, and your question is how do we find the optimum basis. I am not sure this is relevant to your comments, but I am taking the whole sweep of the national concern—not only Federal, but American society should give support, whether it's in scientific research, defense, or health. University presses produce some of our most elegant reviews and publications, but embodied in all of these is a disinclination on the part of the university to plan for the future. The university does not have a very good mechanism for doing this. We must get to the point where we can have within our institutions the capacity for planning ahead with a distinctive format. When we know what the optimum settings are, conflicts can be reconciled in terms of the particular aims. This we are not doing. So we say on the one hand that we should be back at the high table, but on the other hand we are plastering the whole ship of the university with endless kinds of barnacle-like arrangements for public activities that atrophy. Look at any university catalog and you will find the average 60 departments in the traditional university sense. But they will have three times that number in the way of centers, institutes, and other kinds of arrangements.

The second point is that the administrator of the modern university in America has become instrumental and not integrative. He has cultivated outside contacts, and fundamentally the program development has resulted from this activity vis-a-vis Federal agencies and others. Generally speaking, and I am really overstating my generalization, he has lost what I would call integrative arrangements. They break down again on the planning mechanism.

The third point is that we had better start admitting the nature of our public commitment openly in university life. Public services usually are plastered on the outside of the university. I say "on the outside" because these things don't really make their way into the corporate body of the university. They tend to remain on the surface, maintained by administrators.

FROM THE FLOOR: The classic example is the recent case of the University of Pennsylvania at which classified research on biological and chemical warfare is being done—a distortion, according to the faculty, of the university's official role. Yet, this is just one slight example. Where should these solutions come from?

DR. MILLER: I don't think that's answerable. There is one exception, though—the university cannot be excused from finding a way to plan its own distinctive methods. If it does not do this, it's vulnerable.

DR. ALLER: Society is faced with social problems, such as unemployment. You have to get a hold of capital so that you can go out and buy a piece of a university somewhere and divert basically intellectual resources from other activities to this one direction. I suppose the point you are really making is how this kind of laissez faire competition brings us out. Maybe this is the desirable way to do it, because capturing resources in Washington does reflect some kind of social judgment as to relative priorities among problems. It's simply realistic if "X" million dollars are on the table to work on a particular set of problems that divert university resources in that direction.

The Role of the University

FROM THE FLOOR: I think it might be well to dwell on this question of the role of the university. According to your remarks about the history of the university, the concept was that of preserving some body of knowledge which was known and fixed from elements of society which might be disruptive. This goes back to the medieval era. I think the university would feel the pressures less now in terms of competing for available resources within the community if they did have a better operated idea of what their function is today. I think today we understand that we should not consider all the intellectual resources of this country to be limited to the university community so far as getting people who are interested in and available to work on specific problems. The area of elementary and secondary education is extremely important, which is another important point you made, concentrating on the human resources which are being wasted now for the lack of good elementary and secondary school systems. These problems would not arise in the university in quite the form they do now regarding the setting up of different tracks of learning to meet lesser needs and lesser skills if we concentrated our efforts in giving everyone the best education available, without being concerned about vocational chores at this point in life. Now is the time to stress elementary and secondary

education. Along these lines, the university ought to be more than just a community of scholars in the ivy retreat. They don't have a monopoly on knowledge. Knowledge is something that is being brought into existence all over the world in every area of society. I think they might do more to seek it out where it is, to learn from people who are living with problems, and thus not restrict the university to the role of being the dispenser of something which is known and fixed.

DR. MILLER: I agree with your point there. There is a flow in and out, a sort of fixed preservation for successive generations. Some of it remains there. It has become much more elaborated in all sections of the country. The university is an agency, in a broad meaning of the word, that by its own admission ought to look at problems in a total framework. It has a particular obligation regarding the flow of knowledge at a time when our problems tend to become increasingly general, but our solutions become increasingly specialized. This is quite an enigma.

FROM THE FLOOR: Possibly the university itself is a transitional institution. Perhaps if we had a type of institution which is not burdened by the necessity of instructing anybody in anything, all these barnacles we are talking about would disappear. We should have something which would be free to engage in thought about these problems and not be burdened to teach. Maybe the university should not occupy the center position. Maybe it's just a convenient source because of its central location. It has a structure, people, a budget, and it grows. But maybe it's not the best suited institution for the examination of these problems.

DR. MILLER: Are you implying some separation of function, perhaps institutional arrangements other than the university to handle some of them?

FROM THE FLOOR: Possibly, to the extent that you want to examine the values of society and not simply accept them.

FROM THE FLOOR: It seems to me, that where you locate your major universities, you locate your manpower resources as well. Take a rural State like your own. A university contributes to at least one manpower dilemma in that it tends to attract many of the people with ability from the rural areas. In some States the university is the primary cultural area. So it would be difficult to implement the previous suggestion if the university itself is defeat-

ing the proliferation of manpower resources throughout the State.

DR. MILLER: Yes. On the other hand, and I don't mean to attach a positive or negative value to this statement, it is often used as an attractor of industry which is research related. Your concern is that the university may pull people in orbit and deplete other sectors?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes, inasmuch as I see young people like myself come from small towns to attend universities located in major cities. We stay there because that's where the action is. People from southern States go North to Harvard, Yale, and the other major universities. We get a fine education and an excellent job opportunity. We go to New York and we go to Washington. We don't go back to where the knowledge is really needed.

DR. ALLER: This touches on a major point concerning the allocation of resources within the university community between the small and the large, the North and the South, the heavy industrial areas and the rural areas.

Exodus of Intellectual Resources

DR. MILLER: I am concerned, and always will be, to see the intellectual resources of the area drift constantly outward at all levels. You see the urban centers holding ground better than the hinterland communities and towns. It's a vicious circle and it is always painful to watch. In West Virginia, the miners who pay taxes keep professors on the faculties who make five times more and have a lifetime contract, tenure, and all the rest. The sons and daughters of those miners come into the university and then go to Baltimore, New York City, Washington, and elsewhere. The system sees to it that most of our star graduates are exported to other places. There is a certain kind of national allocation going on here, and perhaps it's in the national interest. If a young journalist can serve on a Washington paper, he would be trapped in one of the back-country towns. Then who gains by all of this? The migration of students follows that of faculty members. A man takes his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, then comes to West Virginia and gets off to a start. He spends 7 years, publishes his first book, and then leaves for M.I.T. If we are not careful, areas of the country depleted in terms of educational sys-

tems, not only the universities but the lower schools as well, become the farm clubs—the training centers—for the big leagues. The question turns back to the strategy of how one organizes for intellectual competence. I used to say all through my years at West Virginia, "I am not going to have this place imitate any other institution in the country." What ought to be the distinct personality of an institution? You must first determine what the university wants to do and does well. I think when these goals are mapped out, you begin to find certain strategies of aiding and maintaining competence in intellectual merit. You cannot if you simply become imitative of other institutions.

DR. ALLER: Dr. Miller, what do you think your strategy is going to be now, as between Harvard and West Virginia?

DR. MILLER: My first strategy is to reduce the paperwork on my desk.

DR. ALLER: Should it be Federal educational strategy in terms of allocation of resources or intellectual endeavor?

DR. MILLER: I think I have been in higher education long enough and have had enough different jobs in it not to be altogether unwise about the various sides of argument. We have great arguments about project-oriented grants, for instance, in higher education all the time. I could put up a very good argument for the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Health, that by making grants to people who are capable of doing the work, we really add to the intellectual versatility of the country. I think I could argue this, and defend, up to now at least, the kinds of strategies that we have taken. But now we have reached the point of Federal support to universities where we ought to begin exploring alternative methods which would promote better planning, distinctive formats, and so on. What happens when you are a university president? You get up every morning and see 50 newsletters which present you with opportunities for grants. If you are sitting in Morgantown, you see, for example, where the University of Kentucky received $250,000. The trouble is, your faculty is reading this too. All of a sudden you are on an airplane coming to Washington yourself.

As we look ahead we are beginning now to experiment with a variety of institutional grants which, in part, will be responsive

to an institution's ability to plan a distinctive set of goals. The Federal support we are talking about in this instance will come into the background to help the institution at given points to achieve those goals, which are not imitation goals but are useful and relevant to that particular setting. I have grown a little tired, as a university man, of the almost totally client-oriented project system. This, among other things, has made it almost impossible for university management itself. There are agencies dealing with medical schools, departments of economics, individual scholars, and I know what impact all of this has on institutions. We ought to begin now to explore bloc institutional grants. Would you want to question this?

DR. ALLER: No. We are modestly moving in a similar direction in our manpower institutional grants, which are bloc grants.

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you also see a need for better Federal planning and coordination of programs which make demands on universities or try to help them develop personnel? I have had a feeling that, for example, in physics, demands for personnel for research were not at all well coordinated with the training programs, and that this creates a fairly serious imbalance in institutions.

Pride in Individual Goals

DR. MILLER: I have to agree with you, having been on that side for so long. It is not only the different objectives of the various programs which do not completely commingle. There are great differences in accounting procedures for various internal procedural rules of the game which become very trying and altogether tasteless. I long for the day when there can be an arrangement in our country that will help institutions to develop pride in distinctive missions. I would hope these objectives would be made explicit, and university administrators could then examine and debate various proposals for assistance in achieving their institution's particluar set of goals. Out of the 2,000 colleges and universities in this country, perhaps 100 of them are wealthy enough and have enough leadership to establish offices in Washington, where they can station a substantial proportion of their

leadership. But in the other 1,900, every time a man goes to Washington, there is no backup for him in his university job. One of the several reasons that those 1,900 colleges and universities are not really doing a good job of innovative planning for distinctive missions is that their leaders are out in the grantsmanship circles, and there is no one to mind the store at home. It's a great loss. At Michigan State you can have 10 or 15 of your top leaders on the road all the time and the place still operates. You can't do that at the weaker institutions. So there has to be a more rational approach to this problem.

FROM THE FLOOR: I have been particularly concerned about the fact that we were not making sense between programs which arrange to increase training and supply of personnel, and those which create demand.

DR. ALLER: The medical and teaching fields are two good examples. We have simultaneous expansion of government demand, but without any effort being made to increase or adapt supply to meet that demand, except in market terms, and then we get shortages or rate distortions.

DR. MILLER: We talk about educational services for handicapped children without preparing the people to handle them. We have great hopes for counseling students for vocational or other purposes, but I don't see where we are training the personnel.

DR. ALLER: Who should take on that function in Government? Many here have wrestled with this question of manpower planning; even for specialized categories, it turns out to be an enormously complex job. There is great difficulty in tying together the respective departments that might have bits and pieces of the knowledge, and in developing a Government response which focuses on what I call the nonsex appeal activities. It's politically appealing to approve a new program and it's easy to say you need money for it, but it's extraordinarily difficult to say that you need manpower resources for that program.

FROM THE FLOOR: What do you think is the best way for the circle to be completed so that the universities can form their own programs and the Government can have a fruitful relationship with the academic world? It seems to me there is not the polarity we are talking about. There is considerable intellectual intercourse and financial relationship. So what is left is the develop-

ment of a relationship which would make the best decisions for both poles of this discussion.

DR. MILLER: I am sure you have thought a great deal about this. You know, one gets so far and then gets bogged down. Advisory committees; testimony prior to the passage of a bill; much contributes to the traffic that goes on here in an advisory way. We—and I am talking about efforts of institutions as a whole—must find a way to do this. You have a sort of constituent clientele that builds up and involves a particular professional subunit of a university or foundation, and a particular group of interested people in the Congress. There is never really an ultimate reconciliation between them about what it means to the needs of the country as a whole or to a given institution. I am not speaking as an administrator, but as a faculty member, and I know you are interested in social research. All will revolve around this. I really feel that these units of discussion and these advisory arrangements must increasingly become institutions on a statewide basis. I feel we have to cut around so many specialized features of this—specialized Congressmen, specialized universities, specialized Washington contingents—that the unit of discussion is never what the institution as a whole is going to do.

FROM THE FLOOR: The recent decision of the Internal Revenue Service to further tighten up on education in the income tax demonstrates the inability of the total population to effect these retraining possibilities for continuing education. Systematic analysis of the total problem is lacking. On the one hand, the Internal Revenue Service takes away the motivation for people to engage in a continuing program of education; on the other hand, the Office of Education is pumping millions of dollars into specialized programs.

DR. ALLER: There is a test of assumptions both ways. We simply don't know what the motivational factor is.

FROM THE FLOOR: That's right. There is a very obvious incongruity in policy among different divisions of the Government, with the financial considerations being tossed in.

Government Encouragement

I am interested in the 1,900 universities you mentioned to the extent that they could possibly perform functions that need not be specialized. What can the Federal Government do to help encourage leadership in these universities, to help develop special interests and special skills?

DR. MILLER: It's not altogether the special ones that need to be developed. I don't know what governmental actions will help encourage these. I think we talk too much about gray places and not-so-gray places, while there are unique missions within the tradition of higher education yet to be accomplished. I have lived long enough to know that the junior college is longing for the day when it can be a 4-year college and have a football team, a field house, and a stadium. The State college, which has been a junior college and a teachers college in the past, is somehow hoping for the day when it can persuade the legislature to change its name to university. And universities which are in a certain set situation are somehow hoping that they can be a miniature Harvard. So everyone gets involved. I think there ought to be a proud tradition that this whole institutional spectrum can have. There should be a greater concern on the part of the State for total systems of higher education. In West Virginia, there are 21 institutions of higher learning, all of which come under a certain order of legitimacy—namely, in this case, the State. There ought to be some rational way the distinctive missions of all 21 could fit into a community of interest. Maybe we could get over this mad race to be like someone else. I know many colleges around the country that should remain colleges, but they want to be called universities. They would be much better off to be proud of their particular mission as a college. We are not encouraging this.

FROM THE FLOOR: I was somewhat startled by your view that one of the objectives of Government grants could be to help universities find themselves. If your idea were to be instituted, and institutions of higher learning were obliged to commit themselves to specific goals and objectives, what would be the role of the Federal Government in the evaluation, assessment, and making of these goals?

DR. MILLER: I think I am being misread a little. I have a feel-

ing that the autonomy, self-management, and integrity of institutions of higher learning would be far greater if there were more opportunities for representatives of those institutions to discuss ways and means by which support from various Federal sources could help that institution achieve its goals.

FROM THE FLOOR: Who would they discuss that with? Would the bloc grant then assist in achieving such and such goals?

DR. MILLER: Yes. I have watched it happen and I know what you are getting at. I think these goals are good ones. The National Science Foundation grants to developing institutions in science and technological areas somehow became pertinent to the institution I was representing. Our engineering people did a fine job of self-examination. Not only that, but this had to be reconciled with the entire university and this forced us into a whole concern for institutional goals. How to stimulate these discussions, I don't know, but it ought to be possible. It certainly ought to be done in the fields of education and health which make up half the support of a university.

FROM THE FLOOR: In my field, one of the problems in the university's contribution is the failure to support fairly nonconformist philosophical discussion, a framework in which we are not meeting our major problems. How should the university meet this need for ongoing nonconformist thought? In the field of international economic relations, there is a great deal of interplay and philosophical discussions between representatives of Government programs and universities. But it is not a very successful area in the program for teaching. There is a need, as I see it, for some cleavage between those who are carrying on existing programs under existing concepts, and a reexamination of basic concepts. The universities are completely unaware of this.

DR. MILLER: I have been especially interested in international education and development and their economic aspects. For 15 years the university has been on a contract basis, project for project, and it has not fundamentally built up an underlying capability in the field, broadly speaking, of international affairs. You spend 15 years hiring faculty beyond your own budgetary margin, just hoping that AID or other contracts don't materialize, because if they do you are going to get caught with dozens of people financed beyond your budgetary limitation. As a result,

you don't build an underlying capability in the institution; you simply build on margin. Until we get something like the International Education Act, based upon longrun institutional support in research, graduate study, and other fields, we will not have this distinctive force of which we are speaking with competence for the long range.

FROM THE FLOOR: The university does not perform its historic role as a critic of society.

DR. MILLER: Exactly. But the building up of strength of a university cannot be done on a piece-by-piece service to the Federal Government's needs.

DR. ALLER: I would like to express once again, Dr. Miller, our sincere appreciation for your being willing to take time out from what I know is a very busy introduction to Government responsibilities. Thank you.

DR. MILLER: I have had a grand time.

July 1967

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1967—O 260-369

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Copies of this publication or additional information on manpower programs and activities may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D. C. Publications on manpower are also available from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
Wolf Avenue and Commerce Street, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201
Ninth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1365 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
730 17th Street, Denver, Colorado 80202
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
Curtis C. Aller, Director